SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	DEFENDANTS City of Philodolphic Police		
Brian Morrison	Sergeant Massi, and City of Philadelphia Police		
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Pennsylvania (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)	Officer, John Doe County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.		
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Gay Chacker & Mittin, P.C., 1731 Spring Gare Philadelphia, PA	Attorneys (If Known) den St		
☐ 1 U.S. Government ☐ 3 Federal Question	CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff (For Diversity Cases Only) PTP DEF itizen of This State One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF itizen of This State One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF itizen of This State One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Plaintiff One Box for		
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant ☐ 4 Diversity CIndicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	itizen of Another State		
	itizen or Subject of a 3 3 Foreign Nation 6 6 6 Foreign Country		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)			
CONTRACT TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTES		
□ 120 Marine □ 310 Airplane □ 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice □ 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability □ 368 Asbestos Personal □ 340 Marine PERSONAL PROPERTY □ 345 Marine Product □ 370 Other Fraud □ 371 Truth in Lending □ 372 Truth in Lending □ 372 Truth in Lending □ 373 Truth in Lending □ 373 Truth in Lending □ 373 Truth in Lending □ 375 Morter Personal □ 375 Morter Personal □ 442 Employment □ 441 Voting □ 375 Morter Person	422 Appeal 28 USC 158		
Proceeding State Court Appellate Court Re	einstated or		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Rief description of cause	g (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):		
Excessive force, False arr VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: □ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:		
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See instructions): JUDGE	JURY DEMAND:		
DATE SIGNATURE OF ATFORNE			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			
RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP	JUDGE MAG. JUDGE		

Case 2:12-cv-00063-TON Document 1 Filed 01/06/12 Page 2 of 10

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar. S. 21st Street, Philadelphia, PA 19146 Address of Plaintiff: 1221 Address of Defendant: 1515 Arch Street, 14th, Philadelphia, PA 19102 Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: 18th & Washington Avenue, Philadelphia, PA (Use Reverse Side For Additional Space) Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock? $_{\mathrm{Yes}}\square$ No (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) No Yes□ Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Case Number: Date Terminated: Judge Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions: 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? $_{\mathrm{Yes}}\square$ No♥ 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously Yes□ No terminated action in this court? 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Yes CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) A. Federal Question Cases: B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: 1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2.

FELA 2.

Airplane Personal Injury 3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury 3. □ Assault, Defamation 4. □ Antitrust 4. □ Marine Personal Injury 5. Patent 5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. □ Labor-Management Relations 6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. Civil Rights 7. □ Products Liability 8.

Products Liability — Asbestos 8. □ Habeas Corpus 9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases 9. □ All other Diversity Cases 10. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11. □ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check Appropriate Category) counsel of record do hereby certify: ☐ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; □ Relief other than monetary damages is sought. DATE: Attorney-at-Law Attorney I.D.# NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above. DATE: Attorney I.D.# Attorney-at-Law

CIV. 609 (6/08)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Brian Mo	orrison	:	CIVIL ACTION		
		i			
	v. Philadelphia Police Sergeant Massi Philadelphia Police Officer, John		NO.		
	In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.				
	SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING O	CASE MANAGEMENT TRA	CKS:		
	(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 2	8 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 22	:55.	()
	(b) Social Security – Cases requesting revie and Human Services denying plaintiff S		ry of Health	()
	(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be desig	nated for arbitration under Lo	cal Civil Rule 53.2.	()
	(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for p exposure to asbestos.	ersonal injury or property dan	nage from	()
	(e) Special Management – Cases that do no commonly referred to as complex and the court. (See reverse side of this form	nat need special or intense man	nagement by	u u	
	management cases.)			()

(f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.

Plaintiff, Brian Morrison

Attorney for

215-567-7955

215-567-6809

bchacker@gaychackermittin.net

Telephone

FAX Number

E-Mail Address

(Civ. 660) 10/02

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

BRIAN MORRISON :

V. : JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA :

POLICE SERGEANT MASSI : Civil Action No.____

Individually and as a Police Sergeant

for the City of Philadelphia;

and : CITY OF PHILADELPHIA :

POLICE OFFICER, JOHN DOE
Individually and as a Police Officer:

For the City of Philadelphia :

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Brian Morrison, ("Mr. Morrison" or "plaintiff"), by and through his attorneys, Gay Chacker & Mittin, P.C., hereby asserts the following Complaint against defendants, City of Philadelphia Police Sergeant Massi ("defendant Massi"), Police Officer John Doe, ("defendant Doe"), (collectively "defendants"), as follows:

Parties

- 1. Plaintiff is and was at all material times a resident of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- 2. Defendant Police Sergeant Massi was at all times relevant to this action a sergeant of the City of Philadelphia Police Department. He is being sued in his individual capacity as a police officer for the City of Philadelphia.
- 3. Defendant Police Officer John Doe was at all times relevant to this action an officer of the City of Philadelphia Police Department. He is being sued in his individual capacity as a police officer for the City of Philadelphia.

Jurisdiction

4. This action is brought pursuant to 42 United States Code Section 1983.

Jurisdiction is based upon 28 United States Code 1331 and 1343. Plaintiff further invokes the supplemental jurisdiction under 28 United States Code Section 1376(a) to hear and decide claims under state law.

Facts

- 5. On January 21, 2010, Mr. Morrison and his father, a retired Septa Police Officer were coming from the Laundromat at 18th & Washington and proceeded to walk to his vehicle which was parked on Washington Avenue west of 18th Street at approximately 12:30 p.m.
- 6. Once Mr. Morrison was in his vehicle, he looked out his rear view mirror and saw three vehicles stopped at the intersection behind him for a red light.
 - 7. Mr. Morison proceeded to pull out of his parking spot with caution.
- 8. Suddenly, Mr. Morrison had to slam on his brakes because the first vehicle sped off and almost ran into his vehicle.
 - 9. Mr. Morrison and the driver of the other vehicle engaged in a verbal argument.
 - 10. There was a police patrol car in a position to witness the entire incident.
- 11. Upon information and belief, defendant Massi and defendant Doe (collectively "defendants") were the officers in the patrol vehicle.
- 12. After the argument began, defendants pulled in front of Mr. Morrison and the other vehicle.
- 13. The defendants spoke with the driver of the other vehicle, who was Caucasian and allowed him to leave the scene.
- 14. As the defendants spoke with the other driver, Mr. Morrison, who is African American, began to exit his vehicle, but was instructed by the defendants to get back in his

vehicle and turn it off.

- 15. After allowing the other, Caucasian driver to leave, the defendants approached Mr. Morrison and his father and, without provocation or basis in law, grabbed Mr. Morrison by his jacket, yanked him out of his vehicle, handcuffed him.
- 16. At no point in time was Mr. Morrison advised that he had committed any crime or why he had been forcibly removed from the vehicle.
- 17. Mr. Morrison told the police officers that the handcuffs were too tight and inquired why he had been treated the way he had been. The defendants told him "this is what happens when you resist arrest".
- 18. It was not until Mr. Morrison's father explained that he was a retired police officer that the defendants removed the handcuffs and told Mr. Morrison to leave the scene.
- 19. Mr. Morrison never violated any law of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and never was charged with any crime.
- 20. As a direct and proximate result of the actions or inactions of the defendants, Mr. Morrison's forearm was swollen and in pain.
 - 21. Mr. Morrison continues to suffer from anxiety, fear, and mental harm.
- 22. As a direct and proximate result of the defendants' actions, Mr. Morrison was deprived of rights, privileges and immunities under the Fourth, Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and in particular the right, the right to be free from false arrest and the right to due process of law.
- 23. The actions and/or inactions of the defendants violated the clearly established federal constitutional rights of Mr. Morrison to freedom from use of unreasonable and unjustified force against his person, the right to be free from false arrest/false imprisonment and the right to

due process of law.

COUNT ONE

42 U.S.C. § 1983 Against Individual Defendants City of Philadelphia Police Sergeant, Massi and City of Philadelphia Police Officer John Doe

- 24. Plaintiff hereby incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 24, inclusive, of his Complaint as if the same were set forth at length herein.
- 25. Plaintiff claims damages for the injuries set forth above under 42 U.S.C. Section 1983 against the defendant police officers for violation of Mr. Morrison's constitutional rights under color of law.
- 26. As aforesaid, defendants, acting within the course and scope of the City of Philadelphia employment, under color of state law, and pursuant to the customs, policies and practices of the City of Philadelphia Police Department intentionally and maliciously pulled Mr. Morrison from his vehicle and tightly handcuffed him; deprived Mr. Cortes of his rights, privileges and immunities under the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the United States; in particular, the right to be free from excessive use of force by an officer; which violated Mr. Morrison's rights under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, the laws of the United States, and were in violation of 42 U.S.C. Section 1983.
- 27. The defendants within the course and scope of their employment, under color of state law, and pursuant to the customs, policies and practices of their respective City of Philadelphia Police Department intentionally and maliciously assaulted and battered Mr. Morrison, and used their positions of authority illegally and improperly to punish Mr. Morrison as set forth above which violated Mr. Cortes' rights under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, the laws of the United States, and were in violation of 42 U.S.C. Section 1983.

- 28. The defendants have been deliberately indifferent to the rights of citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and, in particular, City of Philadelphia to be free from excessive force, which deliberate indifference violated Mr. Morrison's rights under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, the laws of the United States, and were in violation of 42 U.S.C. Section 1983.
- 29. The defendants invaded the privacy and/or cast Mr. Morrison in a false light by making it appear to others that Mr. Morrison had violated or was violating the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania or of another jurisdiction.
 - 30. As a result of the above actions, Mr. Morrison suffered the damages as aforesaid.
- 31. The actions of defendants were so malicious, intentional and reckless, and displayed such a reckless indifference to Mr. Morrison's rights and well being that the imposition of punitive damages is warranted.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff, Brian Morrison, II, demands judgment in his favor and against the defendants, for compensatory damages, punitive damages, reasonable attorney fees and costs, interest; and such other and further relief as appears reasonable and just.

COUNT TWO

42 U.S.C. § 1983 Against Individual Defendants City of Philadelphia Police Sergeant, Massi and City of Philadelphia Police Officer John Doe

- 32. Plaintiff hereby incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 31, inclusive, of his Complaint as if the same were set forth at length herein.
- 33. Plaintiff claims damages for the injuries set forth above under 42 U.S.C. Section 1983 against the defendant police officers for violation of Mr. Morrison's constitutional rights under color of law.
 - 34. As aforesaid, defendants, acting within the course and scope of the City of

Philadelphia employment, under color of state law, and pursuant to the customs, policies and practices of the City of Philadelphia Police Department, intentionally and maliciously, falsely arrested and imprisoned Mr. Morrison when they pulled him from his vehicle and tightly handcuffed him, depriving Mr. Morrison of his rights, privileges and immunities under the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the United States; in particular, the right to be free from excessive use of force by an officer; which violated Mr. Morrison's rights under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, the laws of the United States, and were in violation of 42 U.S.C. Section 1983.

- 35. The defendants within the course and scope of their employment, under color of state law, and pursuant to the customs, policies and practices of their respective City of Philadelphia Police Department, intentionally and maliciously, falsely arrested and falsely imprisoned Mr. Morrison, and used their positions of authority illegally and improperly to punish Mr. Morrison as set forth above which violated Mr. Morrison's rights under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, the laws of the United States, and were in violation of 42 U.S.C. Section 1983.
- 36. The defendants have been deliberately indifferent to the rights of citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and, in particular, City of Philadelphia to be free from false arrest and false imprisonment, which with deliberate indifference violated Mr. Morrison's rights under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, the laws of the United States, and were in violation of 42 U.S.C. Section 1983.
- 37. The defendants invaded the privacy and/or cast Mr. Morrison in a false light by making it appear to others that Mr. Morrison had violated or was violating the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania or of another jurisdiction.

38. As a result of the above actions, Mr. Morrison suffered the damages as aforesaid.

39. The actions of defendants were so malicious, intentional and reckless, and displayed such a reckless indifference to Mr. Morrison's rights and well being that the imposition of punitive damages is warranted.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff, Brian Morrison, II, demands judgment in his favor and against the defendants, for compensatory damages, punitive damages, reasonable attorney fees and costs, interest; and such other and further relief as appears reasonable and just.

BSC5184

BRIAN S. CHACKER, ESQUIRE GAY CHACKER & MITTIN, P.C. 1731 Spring Garden Street Philadelphia, PA 19130 (215) 567-7955

fax: (215) 567-6809

bchacker@gaychackermittin.net

Attorneys for Plaintiff Brian Morrison

Date: January 6, 2012